arXiv:1405.3330v1 [math.CO] 13 May 2014

Containment: A Variation of Cops and Robbers

Natasha Komarov* and John Mackey†

May 15, 2014

Abstract

We consider "Containment": a variation of the graph pursuit game of Cops and Robber in which cops move from edge to adjacent edge, the robber moves from vertex to adjacent vertex (but cannot move along an edge occupied by a cop), and the cops win by "containing" the robber—that is, by occupying all $\deg(v)$ of the edges incident with a vertex v while the robber is at v. We develop bounds that relate the minimal number of cops, $\xi(G)$, required to contain a robber to the well-known "cop-number" $c(G)$ in the original game: in particular, $c(G) \leq \xi(G) \leq \gamma(G)\Delta(G)$. We note that $\xi(G) \geq \delta(G)$ for all graphs G, and analyze several families of graphs in which equality holds, as well as several in which the inequality is strict. We also give examples of graphs which require an unbounded number of cops in order to contain a robber, and note that there exist cubic graphs with $\xi(G) \geq \Omega(n^{1/6})$.

1 Introduction

The game of Cops and Robbers (or more accurately, Cops and Robber) on graphs was introduced independently by Nowakowski and Winkler [14] and Quilliot [15], and has generated a great deal of study in the three decades since; see, e.g., [1, 4, 11, 12]. In the original formulation a cop chooses a vertex as her initial placement on a connected, undirected graph G; the robber then places himself at a vertex. The players move alternately from vertex to adjacent vertex (or stay where they are) with full information. The cop's goal is to minimize capture time (that is, the time until both players occupy the same vertex at the same time); the robber's goal is to maximize it. There are graphs on which a robber playing optimally can elude the cop forever; for instance, chasing the robber on the 4-cycle is clearly a hopeless

*Dept. of Math., Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh PA 15213, USA; nkom@cmu.edu.
†Dept. of Math., Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh PA 15213, USA; jmackey@andrew.cmu.edu.

endeavor for the cop. Graphs on which a cop can win are called "cop-win." More precisely, a graph is cop-win if there is a vertex u such that for every vertex v, the cop beginning at u can capture a robber beginning at v. Cop-win graphs—also known as "dismantlable" graphs [14]—have appeared in statistical physics [5, 6] as well as combinatorics and game theory.

A natural generalization of this game is to allow $k \geq 1$ cops. The moves alternate as before between the set of cops and the robber, with every cop making her move (from vertex to adjacent vertex) and then the robber making his. The game again ends when a single cop occupies the same vertex as the robber. Graphs on which k cops have a winning strategy are called k-cop-win (see [7] for some characterizations of k-cop-win graphs). The smallest positive integer k such that k cops suffice to win on G is called the cop number of G. The study of the cop number of graphs has generated perhaps the greatest interest in the area of Cops and Robbers research. Meyniel's Conjecture (see, e.g. [10, 13], et al.) states that no more than $O(\sqrt{n})$ cops are ever necessary on a graph with n vertices.

In this paper, a variation of Cops and Robber called "Containment" is introduced, in which the cops move from edge to adjacent edge. The robber moves from vertex to adjacent vertex but cannot move through an edge occupied by a cop; both sides continue to have perfect information as before. Instead of capturing the robber by occupying the same vertex at the same time, the cops now want to "contain" the robber by occupying all of the edges incident with the robber's location. That is, the game ends when the robber has no more moves. We will allow the cops and robber to stay put whenever they wish, and a single edge will be allowed to be occupied by multiple cops at the same time. If k cops can contain a robber on a graph G, then G is said to be **k-cop-containable**. Since $\delta(G)$ (the minimal degree of G) cops are always required, we will call G **containable** if $k=\delta(G)$ cops suffice to contain the robber on G, and **uncontainable** otherwise. We will call the smallest k such that G is k-cop-containable the **containability number** of G, written $\xi(G)$.

For any graph G, we will define by $\Delta(G)$ the maximum among the degrees of the vertices of G. A **dominating set** of G is any set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that for all $v \in V(G)$, there exists $w \in S$ such that $d(v, w) \leq 1$. The **domination number** of G, denoted $\gamma(G)$, is the size of

a smallest dominating set of G. All graphs will be assumed to be connected in what follows.

2 Preliminaries

We begin with the following relationship between the containability number $\xi(G)$ in Containment and the cop number $c(G)$ in Cops and Robber.

Theorem 2.1. *For all G, $c(G) \leq \xi(G) \leq \Delta(G)\gamma(G)$.*

Proof. For the first inequality, let σ be a winning cop strategy in Containment on the graph G, executed by the $\xi(G)$ cops required to contain the robber. Let ρ be the Cops and Robber strategy derived from σ in the following way. If σ places the $\xi(G)$ cops initially on edges $e_1=u_1v_1$, $e_2=u_2v_2, \ldots,$ and $e_{\xi(G)}=u_{\xi(G)}v_{\xi(G)}$, then ρ places $\xi(G)$ cops initially on vertices $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{\xi(G)}$. Whenever σ directs a given cop to go from an edge uv to an edge vw, ρ directs a single cop to go from vertex v to vertex w. Note that if a robber is unable to use an edge $e = xy$ in Containment because it is occupied by a cop, then he is unable to use that edge in Cops and Robber, because there is a cop at at least one of the endpoints.

Since the final step of σ is to place at least one cop at each of the edges Rv for $v \in N_G(R)$, where R is the robber's position at that time, the final step of ρ will either be to place a cop on R, capturing the robber immediately, or to place a cop on each neighbor of R, capturing the robber at the next turn.

Consequently, $\xi(G)$ cops suffice to capture the robber in Cops and Robber, and so $c(G) \leq \xi(G)$.

For the second inequality, let S be a dominating set in G.

For each $v \in S$, place one cop on each of the edges incident with v. Suppose that the robber places himself at a vertex x. Note that if $x \in S$, then since there is at least one cop at every edge incident with x, the robber has placed himself in an immediately losing position.

Therefore we can assume that $x \in V(G) \setminus S$. We will show that the cops are able to contain the robber in one step. For any edge that has x as an endpoint, the other endpoint is either in S or not in S. For any edge incident with x that has its other endpoint at some $w \in S$, the cop on edge xw is already incident with the robber, and so remains stationary. For all other

edges incident with x, the other endpoint is some $y \notin S$. Therefore, there exists some $w \in S$ adjacent to y, and consequently there is a cop at edge wy. This cop moves to xy. Therefore, every edge incident with x can be occupied by a cop after one step. □

Note that the bounds in Theorem 2.1 are tight, as both bounds can be met by infinite families of graphs. For the lower bound, consider the family of cycles C_n, which have $c(G) = \xi(G) = 2$ (for all $n \geq 4$). For the upper bound, any complete graph K_n has $\gamma(K_n)=1$, $\Delta(K_n) = n-1$, and $\xi(G) = n-1 = \gamma(K_n)\Delta(K_n)$.

We were unable to prove or disprove immediately the following conjecture.

Conjecture 2.2. *For all graphs G, $\xi(G) \leq \Delta(G)c(G)$.*

Note that if Meyniel's Conjecture were proven true, then this conjecture would yield that $\xi(G) \leq C\Delta(G)\sqrt{n}$ for some constant C. We note that this fact may also be true independently of Meyniel's conjecture.

Furthermore, since $\delta(G) \leq \xi(G)$ for all graphs G, there exist for every $k \in [n-1]$ graphs G on n vertices such that $\xi(G) \geq k$. Note that in Cops and Robber, the assertion that $\delta(G) \leq c(G)$ is only true in general when the girth of G is at least 5.

2.1 Examples and special cases

Considering containability in a few special cases may aid in building intuition about this game. The n-cycle C_n is containable; it has $\delta(C_n)=2$ and two cops can win by "squeezing" the robber between them. The complete graph K_n is also containable, with $\delta(K_n) = n-1$ cops sufficing (since every edge is adjacent to every other edge, any initial placement of the $n-1$ cops will lead to a win in at most one move). On the other hand, trees (on 3 or more vertices) are not containable: $\delta(T)=1$ for any tree, but a single cop cannot force a robber to move from any vertex of higher degree. In fact, the containability number of a tree T is equal to $\Delta(T)$, the maximal degree in the tree.

Another example of a containable graph is the 3-cube Q_3, though this is less obvious. In the following section we will define an infinite family of graphs that generalize Q_3 (though not the usual one!) and prove that every graph in this family is containable.



Figure 1: The cube $Q3$

A family of containable cubic graphs

For any integer $k \geq 3$, define a **k-track** to be a graph consisting of two disjoint k-cycles with vertices labeled $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k$ and $b_1, b_2, \ldots b_k$, respectively, with an edge connecting a_j and b_j for all $j \in [k]$. For notational convenience, we will label the edges in the following way:

$aa_i := \{a_i, a_{i+1}\}$

$ab_i := \{a_i, b_i\}$

$bb_i := \{b_i, b_{i+1}\}$

Note that the graph Q_3 is the 4-track.

Proposition 2.3. *Every k-track is containable, for all $k \geq 3$.*

Proof. Label the three cops $C1, C2$, and $C3$, respectively, and let their initial positions be aa_1, $bb_{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor}$, and $aa_{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor}$.

We claim first that no matter in which direction R moves, the cops will be able to decrease their distance to him until they are adjacent. Suppose that at a given moment, the robber is at b_j and the cops are at aa_i, aa_ℓ, and bb_ℓ such that $1 \leq i < j < \ell \leq \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$, with it being the robber's turn to move.

Case 1. R moves from b_j to $b_{j\pm1}$.

Then $C1$ moves to ab_{i+1}, $C2$ moves to $bb_{\ell-1}$, and $C3$ moves to $aa_{\ell-1}$, so all of the cops decrease their distance to the robber. From here, if no cops are yet adjacent, and the robber moves along the same k-cycle again in either direction, $C1$ will move to bb_{i+1},

$C2$ will move to $bb_{\ell-2}$, and $C3$ will move to $aa_{\ell-2}$. If instead the robber moves to the other k-cycle, $C1$ will move to aa_{i+1}, $C2$ will move to $bb_{\ell-2}$, and $C3$ will move to $aa_{\ell-2}$.

Case 2. R moves from b_j to a_j.

Then $C1$ moves to aa_{i+1}, $C2$ moves to $bb_{\ell-2}$, and $C3$ moves to $aa_{\ell-2}$, again reducing their distances to the robber.

Therefore the robber cannot avoid the following situation, up to permutation of the cops' positions:



Figure 2:

From this position, the robber must move, or else he will be contained on the next turn. Suppose that in the figure above, we label the robber's position a_j, $C1$'s position aa_{j-1}, and the other positions accordingly (based on the labeling scheme defined above). Therefore at his next turn, the robber must move to b_j. In response, $C1$ moves to aa_j, $C2$ moves to ab_{j+1}, and $C3$ moves to b_{j-1}. From here, the cops will win at their next turn regardless of R's move. □

A family of uncontainable cubic graphs

For any integer $k \geq 3$, define the **k-ring of squares** to be the graph consisting of k disjoint four-cycles arranged cyclically with antipodal pairs of points in neighboring four-cycles connected. Figure 3 shows the 4-ring of squares.

Proposition 2.4. *The k-ring of squares is uncontainable for all $k \geq 4$.*

Proof. We will call any edge that is incident with a vertex on a four-cycle, but not itself on a four-cycle, a **bridge**. We claim that if the robber is at a vertex incident with an unoccupied

bridge on his move, then he can guarantee that he will once again be at a vertex incident with an unoccupied bridge on his move within two steps. We will call the set of positions (that is, of locations of the three cops and the robber) with this property $\mathcal{P}$. To see that he can begin in a position in $\mathcal{P}$, note that each cop can be adjacent to at most two bridges. Since $k \geq 4$, there are at least eight bridges. Therefore there exists a bridge with no cops adjacent to it after the cops choose their initial positions, and the robber can initially place himself at either of the two endpoints of this bridge.



Figure 3: The 4-ring of squares is uncontainable

Now suppose that the robber is at a position in $\mathcal{P}$ and assume for contradiction that the cops will be able to prevent the robber from re-entering a position in $\mathcal{P}$ in the next two steps. In particular, suppose that the robber is at the vertex labeled R in Figure 3. If he takes the bridge labeled x_3, he will be adjacent to x_3 (so a cop must be adjacent to x_3, that is, at edges a_1, a_4, b_1, or b_4). The robber can then move to be adjacent to bridges y_1 or y_2; to prevent this from being a position in $\mathcal{P}$ there must be a cop at an edge in $E_1 = \{b_1, b_2, y_1, c_1, c_2\}$ and there must be a cop at an edge in $E_2 = \{b_3, b_4, y_2, c_3, c_4\}$. Note that $E_1 \cap E_2 = \emptyset$ so this takes at least two distinct cops.

The robber could also have moved from R along the edges a_1 or a_4. There must be a cop at an edge in $E_3 = \{a_1, a_2, x_1, d_1, d_2\}$ and a cop at an edge in $E_4 = \{a_3, a_4, x_2, d_3, d_4\}$.

Since the sets E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4 are pairwise disjoint, at least four cops are required to prevent the robber from entering a position in $\mathcal{P}$ within two steps, providing our contradiction.

The analysis remains the same for any $k > 4$. □

It is interesting to note that the 3-ring of squares is, in fact, containable. Three cops, placed at the marked edges as in Figure 4, will contain the robber in 4 moves. We will leave the verification of this fact as an exercise to the reader.



Figure 4: The 3-ring of squares

3 Containability in graphs of large girth

3.1 Graphs with girth larger than a constant

Proposition 3.1. *If G has girth at least 5, then G is not containable (that is, $\xi(G) > \delta(G)$).*

Proof. Let the minimal degree in G be $\delta(G) = \delta$.

Note that the local neighborhood of any vertex R in G contains the graph in Figure 5 as an induced subgraph.

Suppose that the robber is at R. We show that he will not be caught at the next step, regardless of the location of the three cops:



Figure 5:

Let k be any integer with $0 \leq k < \delta$. Suppose that there are k cops adjacent to the robber and without loss of generality, suppose they are at the edges $Ra_1, Ra_2, \ldots, Ra_k$. Then the robber is free to stay put unless for each $i > k$, there is a cop at edge $a_i a_{i,j(i)}$ for some $j(i)$. If this does occur, then the robber moves to a vertex a_i (where $k < i \leq \delta$). After the cops move, at most $k+1$ cops will be adjacent to the robber, with at most two of the edges incident with a_i occupied (namely the edge Ra_i and one edge $a_i a_{i,j(i)}$).

Therefore, any connected graph G with minimal degree at least 3 which contains no 3- or 4-cycles is 3-cop-uncontainable since there is no position from which the robber is forced to lose. □

Note that the above argument proves the following stronger statement.

Proposition 3.2. *On any (connected) graph G, the (deliberate and intelligent) robber will never be contained by $\delta(G)$ cops at a vertex which is not part of a 3- or 4-cycle.*

We note also that a rather similar argument can be used to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *If G has girth at least 7, then $\xi(G) > \delta(G)+1$.*

3.2 Graphs with unbounded containability number

As mentioned in Section 2, for each $k \in [n-1]$, there exist n-vertex graphs G with $\xi(G) \geq k$. We can also find n-vertex regular graphs with containability number bounded below by any fraction of n, by noting the fact that there exist k-regular graphs for any $k \in [n-1]$ so long as nk is even, as a consequence of the Erdös-Gallai characterization of degree sequences. [9] We can also find infinite families of graphs with unbounded containability number without relying on a large minimal degree, as we will see in Theorem 3.5 below. We will make use of the following theorem of Frankl [10].

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose that the minimum degree of G is greater than d and the girth of G is at least $8t-3$. Then $c(G) > d^t$.*

For the proof of this theorem, the reader is directed to Frankl's work.

Theorem 3.5. *For an infinite number of values of n, there exist cubic graphs G on n vertices such that $\xi(G) = \Omega(n^{1/6})$.*

Proof. There exist connected, cubic graphs G with girth g, $n = O(2^{3/4g})$ [2, 3, 16]. That is, the girth of these graphs is at least $\frac{4}{3}\log_2(n) - C$ for some constant C. Therefore letting $d=2$ and $t = \frac{1}{6}\log_2(n) - C$, we get that $g \geq 8t$. Theorem 3.4 then yields that $c(G) > 2^{\frac{1}{6}\log_2(n) - C} = \Omega(n^{1/6})$. It follows from Theorem 2.1 that $\xi(G) \geq \Omega(n^{1/6})$. □

Note that these graphs are also known to exist for every integer $\delta \geq 10$ [8], yielding graphs with $n = O((\delta-1)^{3/4g})$ vertices and containability number at least $\Omega(n^{1/6})$.

4 Directions for future work

As stated in this work, the rules of Containment allow any player to stay put. It is interesting to note that the game changes significantly when the robber is no longer allowed to sit. For instance, only one cop is required to win on a tree in this case, as she can chase the robber down to one of the leaves. The Petersen graph also becomes containable (and in fact, the



Figure 6: An initial configuration of 3 cops that leads to containment in at most two moves when the robber is not allowed to sit at a vertex

initial placement of cops seen in Figure 6 ends the game in at most two moves regardless of the initial placement of the robber).

Clearly the number of cops required in this variation is always at most $\xi(G)$; equality can also hold (for instance, in the case of a complete graph). Studying this variation that places more restriction on the robber's moves may yield interesting results. In addition to the question of containability number, one might wish to study the question of capture time (in both variations).

Another natural direction for future work involves considering the worst case for containability number. Meyniel's Conjecture [10] states that in the original Cops and Robbers game, $O(\sqrt{n})$ cops always suffice to capture a robber on a graph with n vertices. We conjecture (see this conjecture in Section 2 for more information) that the bound $\xi(G) \leq \Delta(G)c(G)$ holds in the case of Containment, which yields an upper bound of $O(\Delta(G)\sqrt{n})$ if Meyniel's Conjecture holds.

References

[1] A. Berarducci and B. Intrigila. On the cop number of a graph. *Adv. Appl. Math.*, 14:389–403, 1993.

[2] N. Biggs. Constructions for cubic graphs with large girth. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 5:56–62, 1998.

[3] N. L. Biggs and M. J. Hoare. The sextet construction for cubic graphs. *Combinatorica*, 3:153–165, 1983.

[4] A. Bonato, P. Golovach, G. Hahn, and J. Kratochvil. The capture time of a graph. *Discrete Math.*, 309:5588–5595, 2009.

[5] G.R. Brightwell and P. Winkler. Maximum hitting time for random walks on graphs. *J. Rand. Struct. and Alg.*, 1(3):263–276, 1990.

[6] G.R. Brightwell and P. Winkler. Hard constraints and the Bethe lattice: adventures at the interface of combinatorics and statistical physics. *Proc. Int'l. Congress of Mathematicians Vol. III, Li Tatsien, ed.*, pages 605–624, 2002.

[7] Nancy E. Clarke and Gary MacGillivray. Characterizations of k-cop-win graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 312(8):1421–1425, 2012.

[8] X. Dahan. Regular graphs of large girth and arbitrary degree. arXiv:1110.5259v4, 2013.

[9] P. Erdös and T. Gallai. Graphs with prescribed degrees of vertices. *Mat. Lapok.*, 11:264–274, 1960.

[10] P. Frankl. Cops and robbers in graphs with large girth and Cayley graphs. *Disc. Appl. Math.*, 17(3):301–305, 1987.

[11] G. Hahn, F. Laviolette, N. Sauer, and R.E. Woodrow. On cop-win graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 258:27–41, 2002.

[12] G. Hahn and G. MacGillivray. A note on k-cop, l robber games on graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 306:2492–2497, 2006.

[13] L. Lu and X. Peng. On Meyniel's conjecture of the cop number. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 71(2):195–205, 2012.

[14] R. Nowakowski and P. Winkler. Vertex to vertex pursuit in a graph. *Discrete Math.*, 43:235–239, 1983.

[15] A. Quilliot. *Homomorphismes, points fixes, rétractations et jeux de poursuite dans les graphes, les ensembles ordonnés et les espaces métriques.* PhD thesis, Université de Paris VI., 1983.

[16] A. Weiss. Girths of bipartite sextet graphs. *Combinatorica*, 4:241–245, 1984.